

### **REMARKS**

In response to the final Office Action of May 15, 2007 and to supplement the response filed on July 16, 2007, Applicants ask that all pending claims presently under consideration be allowed in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks. Claims 1-11, 14, 15, 19-24, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, and 49-55 are pending, of which claims 1, 14, 20, 21, and 44 are independent. Claims 1, 14, 20, 21, 29, 30, 33, 34, 37, 38, 41, 42, 44, 46, and 47 have been amended and claims 28, 31, 32, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43, 45, and 48 have been cancelled. No new matter has been added.

### **Interview Summary**

Applicants thank Examiner Huynh for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during telephone interviews on July 14, 2007 and August 7, 2007. During the interview on August 7, 2007, Examiner Huynh and Applicants' representative discussed the amendment to independent claim 44 reflected in the listing of claims presented above. Examiner Huynh agreed that the amendments to independent claim 44 would overcome the pending rejection and place independent claim 44 in good condition for allowance. This reply reflects the substance of the interviews.

### **Rejection of Claims 44, 46, and 47**

Of the pending claims, claims 44, 46, and 47 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bertram (U.S. Patent No. 5,818,446) in view of Alexa ("Alexa Internet and Netscape Team to Provide Related Sites To Support Smart Browsing") and Furst (U.S. Patent No. 6,297,819). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because neither Bertram, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests the combination of features recited by amended independent claim 44, as described below.

As amended, independent claim 44 recites, *inter alia*, that the additional and new selectable chrome element is defined by the first web resource being accessed, and the additional and new selectable chrome element is based on chrome specification information directly provided by the first web resource being accessed to a user computer executing the web

browsing application. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests these features.

As discussed in the telephone interviews of July 14, 2007 and August 7, 2007, Examiner Huynh agreed that none of Bertram, Alexa, Furst, or any proper combination of the references, describes or suggests that an additional and new selectable chrome element is defined by a web resource being accessed and is based on chrome specification information directly provided by the web resource being accessed to a user computer executing the web browsing application, as recited in amended independent claim 44.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 44 and claims 46 and 47 depending therefrom.

#### **Rejection of Claims 14, 19, 33, and 34**

Of the pending claims, claims 14, 19, 33, and 34 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle (U.S. Patent No. 6,141,010), Alexa, and Furst. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests the combination of features recited by independent claim 14, as described below.

As amended, independent claim 14 recites, *inter alia*, that an added control element is defined by a current server computer serving a current website being displayed, and the added control element is based on chrome specification information directly provided, to a client computer, by the current server computer serving the current website being displayed. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, Furst, nor any proper combination of the references, describes or properly suggests this feature.

As described above, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, do not describe or suggest that an additional and new selectable chrome element is defined by a web resource being accessed and is based on chrome specification information directly provided by the web resource being accessed to a user computer executing the web browsing application. Therefore, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, also do not describe or suggest that an added control element is defined by a current server computer serving a current website being displayed, and the added control element

is based on chrome specification information directly provided, to a client computer, by the current server computer serving the current website being displayed, as recited in amended independent claim 14.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 14 and claims 19, 33, and 34 depending therefrom.

**Rejection of Claims 1-11, 15, 20-24, 29, 30, 37, 38, 41, 42, and 49-55**

Claims 1, 9, 20, and 21 were rejected as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle. Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, nor any proper combination of the two, describes or properly suggests the combination of features recited by amended independent claims 1, 20, and 21.

For example, independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, that a new control element is defined by a current server computer serving a current website being displayed and the new control element is based on chrome specification information directly provided, to a client computer, by the current server computer serving the current website being displayed. Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 because neither Bertram, Hoyle, nor any proper combination of the two, describes or suggests at least these features of independent claim 1.

As described above, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, do not describe or suggest that an additional and new selectable chrome element is defined by a web resource being accessed and is based on chrome specification information directly provided by the web resource being accessed to a user computer executing the web browsing application. Therefore, Bertram, Hoyle, Alexa, or Furst, alone or in the proposed combination, also do not describe or suggest that a new control element is defined by a current server computer serving a current website being displayed and the new control element is based on chrome specification information directly provided, to a client computer, by the current server computer serving the current website being displayed, as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 and claim 9 depending therefrom.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 20 as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, nor any proper combination of the two, describes or properly suggests the combination of features recited by independent claim 20.

In particular, independent claim 20 recites, *inter alia*, that at least one modified control element is defined by a current server computer serving a current website being displayed upon navigation to the current website and the at least one modified control element is based on chrome specification information directly provided, to a client computer upon navigation to the current website, by the current server computer serving the current website being displayed. As described above, Bertram, Hoyle, alone or in the proposed combination, do not describe or suggest that an additional and new selectable chrome element is defined by a web resource being accessed and is based on chrome specification information directly provided by the web resource being accessed to a user computer executing the web browsing application. Therefore, Bertram, Hoyle, alone or in the proposed combination, also do not describe or suggest that at least one modified control element is defined by a current server computer serving a current website being displayed upon navigation to the current website and the at least one modified control element is based on chrome specification information directly provided, to a client computer upon navigation to the current website, by the current server computer serving the current website being displayed, as recited in amended independent claim 20.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 20.

Regarding the rejection of independent claim 21 as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Bertram, Hoyle, nor any proper combination of the two, describes or properly suggests the combination of features recited by independent claim 21.

For example, independent claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, that a new control element is defined by a current server computer serving a selected website being displayed and the new control element is based on chrome specification information directly provided, to a client

computer, by the current server computer serving the selected website being displayed. As described above, Bertram, Hoyle, alone or in the proposed combination, do not describe or suggest that an additional and new selectable chrome element is defined by a web resource being accessed and is based on chrome specification information directly provided by the web resource being accessed to a user computer executing the web browsing application. Therefore, Bertram, Hoyle, alone or in the proposed combination, also do not describe or suggest that a new control element is defined by a current server computer serving a selected website being displayed and the new control element is based on chrome specification information directly provided, to a client computer, by the current server computer serving the selected website being displayed, as recited in amended independent claim 21.

Therefore, for at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 21.

Claims 3, 8, 10, 11, 22-24, and 55, which each depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 21, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle and Alexa. Alexa does not remedy the failure of Bertram and Hoyle to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 1 and 21. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1 and 21, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 3, 8, 10, 11, 22-24, and 55.

Claims 29, 30, 37, 38, 41, 42, and 49-54, which each depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 20, or 21, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle and Furst. Furst does not remedy the failure of Bertram and Hoyle to describe or suggest the subject matter of claims 1, 20, and 21. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 20, and 21, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 29, 30, 37, 38, 41, 42, and 49-54.

Claims 2, 4-7, and 15, which each depend directly or indirectly from claim 1, have been rejected as being unpatentable over Bertram in view of Hoyle, Alexa, and Furst in further view of one of Miller ("An Introduction to the Resource Description Framework," D-Lib Magazine, May 1998, pages 1-12), Peyer (U.S. Patent No. 6,188,401), Brown ("Using Netscape 2" published by Que Corporation 1995, page 74), and Alexa 2 ("Ad on the Bar Campaign

Supplements Alexa's Focused Advertising Program,"

[http://www.alexa.com/press/press\\_releases/ad.html](http://www.alexa.com/press/press_releases/ad.html), pages 1-3, published 12/10/1997).

None of Miller, Peyer, Brown, or Alexa 2 remedy the failure of Alexa, Hoyle, Bertram, and Furst, alone or in combination, to describe or suggest the subject matter of claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 4-7, and 15, which depend directly or indirectly from claim 1.

### Conclusion

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

The fee in the amount of \$790.00 in payment of the RCE fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization.

Applicant : David HYATT et al.  
Serial No. : 09/208,805  
Filed : December 9, 1998  
Page : 18 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-188001 / Browser 05

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/11/2002

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
W. Karl Renner  
Reg. No. 41,265

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1425 K Street, N.W.  
11th Floor  
Washington, DC 20005-3500  
Telephone: (202) 783-5070  
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331

40437004.doc